·REMARKS

Summary of Office Action

Claims 4-8 are pending. These claims have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Cmelik et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,031,992 ("Cmelik").

Applicants' Reply

Applicants respectfully traverse the prior art rejections.

Applicants have amended the claims to clarify their invention based on Examiner's kind comments (Office Action ¶¶ 10-12) that applicants' previous reply describes features not clearly brought out in the claim language.

In particular, claims 4 and 7 now specifically recite that the operation of the processor is divided in two parts (1) an execution phase, and (2) a preceding configuration phase. According to applicant's invention, the program code translation is fully completed in the preceding configuration phase (e.g., in a compiler) so that the fully translated instruction words can be used directly in the subsequent execution phase (without, for example, any need for a translation buffer).

Cmelik does not show, teach or suggest at least this feature of applicants' invention. Cmelick, as previously noted, is directed to translating program code commands during or congruently with execution of the commands. Cmelik describes a procedure for translation according to conditional branches during program execution. See col. 19, ln. 31 – col. 20, ln. 4. This is in contrast to applicants' unconditional translation, which occurs not contemporaneously with execution but beforehand.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 4 and 7 (and their dependent claims 5, 6 and 8)
are patentable over Cmelik.

Conclusion

This application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and prompt
allowance of which are requested. If there are any remaining issues to be resolved, applicants
request the Examiner to kindly contact the undersigned attorney by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

By: _____

Manu J. Tejwani
Patent Office Reg. No. 37,952
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, NY 10012-4498

Attorneys for Applicants
212-408-2614